

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3 through 20 and 22 remain in this application. Claims 2 and 21 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 18, 20 and 22 have been amended.

#### **Objection to the Drawings**

The Office Action objected to Figure 1a stating that it illustrates only that which is old and that it should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--. Applicants respectfully disagree. The specification states at page 5, paragraph 10 that "Figure 1a illustrates a network system according to the preferred embodiment and with respect to the flow of unicast traffic." In addition, the specification states at pages 7-8 in paragraph 16, "Figure 1b again illustrates system 10 of Figure 1a, but the illustration of Figure 1b is intended to depict issues directed to certain inventive aspects and pertain to multicast communications in system 10. Further, as appreciated through the remainder of this document, these aspects preferably are combined with the illustration of Figure 1a whereby system 10 per Figure 1a routes unicast communications in a first overall routing configuration such as in a point-to-point manner in a fully-meshed configuration, whereas system 10 per Figure 1b routes multicast communications in a second overall routing configuration that differs at least in part from the first overall configuration, and for sake of distinction the multicast LSPs are shown with illustrated with dashed arrows." From these descriptions, it is clear that Figure 1b illustrates part of at least one embodiment of the present invention as stated in the claims and thus, does not illustrate only that which is old.

#### **Objection to the Specification**

Correction to the typographical errors in paragraph 18 on page 9 are corrected above.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 6, 8 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0037279 to Zelig et al. (the "Zelig reference"). However, the Office Action indicated that Claims 2-5,7,9-13 and 21-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in

independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The above claims have been amended to include the limitations indicated as allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons, the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact Jessica Smith at (972) 240-5324.

Respectfully submitted,  
GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON, LLP

Dated: October 26, 2007

/Jessica Smith/

Jessica W. Smith  
Reg. No. 39,884

Garlick Harrison & Markison, LLP  
P. O. Box 160727  
Austin, TX 78716-0727  
Phone: (972) 240-5324  
Fax: (469) 366-6731